

through language included in the Labor-HHS-Education funding bill for the past 2 fiscal years.

While I have long decried the litigation orientation of many of this nation's labor and employment laws, I do have concerns about rule-making the area of bargaining unit determinations as such determinations, by their nature, require the type of fact specific analysis that only case-by-case adjudication allows. I believe strongly that the imprecision of a blanket rule limiting the factors considered material to determining the appropriateness of a single location unit detracts from the National Labor Relations Act's goal of promoting stability in labor-management relations. Thus, I feel equally strongly that legislation is necessary to ensure that a specific analysis of the appropriateness of a bargaining unit given the facts and circumstances of a particular case, is conducted through a hearing.

A hearing process regarding the appropriateness of single facility bargaining units will allow a more complete examination of the comprehensive approach to human resource policies and procedures pursued by many employers today that may influence the bargaining unit determination. To limit consideration of relevant factors potentially would undermine the ability of employers to develop flexible solutions to the needs and demands of their work forces and would greatly increase the cost, complexity and uncertainty of labor-management relations where centralized personnel policies are maintained by employers with numerous locations.

The Fair Hearing Act recognizes both the realities of human resource management in today's competitive economic environment and the complexity of bargaining unit determinations, particularly in cases where multifacility employers are involved. The legislation does not attempt to define when a single location bargaining unit is appropriate, but merely requires the NLRB to consider all of the relevant factors in making that determination. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

#### JUSTICE ON TIME ACT OF 1997

### HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the Justice on Time Act of 1997, legislation which would address the profound concern expressed by several of my constituents who have experienced long delays in the processing of their cases by the National Labor Relations Board [NLRB]. The Justice on Time Act of 1997 would require the NLRB to issue a final decision within 1 year on all unfair labor practice complaints where it is alleged that an employer has discharged an employee in an attempt to encourage or discourage union membership.

The Justice on Time Act recognizes that the lives of employees and their families, wondering whether and when they will get their jobs back, are hanging in the balance during the long delays associated with the National Labor Relations Board's processing of unfair labor practice charges. The act also recognizes that the discharge of an employee who engages in

union activity has a particularly chilling effect on the willingness of fellow employees to support a labor organization or to participate in the types of concerted action protected by the National Labor Relations Act [NLRA].

Thus, the legislation requires the Board to resolve discharge cases in a timely manner to send a strong message to both employers and employees that the NLRA can provide effective and swift justice. The Justice on Time Act ensures that employees who are entitled to reinstatement will quickly get their jobs back and employers will not be saddled with liability for large backpay awards.

The median time for National Labor Relations Board processing of all unfair labor practice cases in fiscal year 1995 was 546 days and has generally been well over 500 days since 1982. This length of time is a disservice to the hard-working men and women who seek relief from the Board for unfair treatment in their workplaces. The Justice on Time Act tells the National Labor Relations Board that, at least when it comes to employees who may have wrongly lost their jobs, it must do better and must give employees a final answer on whether they are entitled to their jobs back within 1 year.

#### AGAINST CENSUS SAMPLING

### HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Census Bureau's proposed use of sampling in determining population figures. Counting just 90 percent of our citizens and simply guessing who the rest of us are will have a devastating effect on our ability to accurately assess our needs and budget for the future.

Sampling also undermines the integrity of our political system. Representation in this very House is determined by population. A State could be forced to reduce its number of Representatives solely on the basis of a politically tainted guess.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to exclude anyone in America from the census by relying on a guesstimate. The right to proper representation should never be compromised, for any reason.

Sampling may cost nominally less, and my Republican colleagues and I are committed to reducing spending—but why go through the trouble and cost of counting 90 percent and then leaving the rest up to speculation? Why spend the money at all? We have a census to get the most exact count possible of our population and their demographics. Anything less than that is just a guess—plain and simple.

Sampling our population simply has no worth. Our next census will cost \$4.2 billion. If sampling is used, that price tag will likely fall to \$4.1 billion. The real difference however, is that the taxpayer will not be footing the bill for an accurate count of this Nation's population—but instead will be paying a high price for nothing more than a guess.

At a cost of \$4.1 billion, Mr. Speaker, the American people will surely want more than a soft estimation. Anything other than a full count of citizens, where all can be represented, is simply unacceptable.

CLATSKANIE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RAISE FOOD FOR CHILDREN

### HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1997

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of high school students in Oregon for not only their vision, but for their dedication and hard work to make dreams become reality.

In 1990, Clatskanie High School student, Gennie Sluder Harris, started a program called Help Hungry Kids with the belief that one person can make a difference. Seven years later, her dream has caught on with nearly 4.5 million pounds of food being collected throughout the country to help feed disenfranchised children.

Often, Americans pride themselves on a prosperous lifestyle, but in truth, according to research of Clatskanie's, Help Hungry Kids students, 1 in 4 children in this Nation goes to bed hungry—a silent hunger.

The program is simple: If you already have a food drive established in your high school, report your totals to Clatskanie. If you don't have a food drive—start one and report your totals. The food and money raised stays in your community and State. With just two cans of food and \$1, schools can participate and States can compete against another, with the top State being recognized at the national conference of the National Association of Student Councils.

The students of Clatskanie High School urge kids across the Nation to catch the dream and show how to make a positive difference. I encourage kids across the Nation to engage the schools in this incredibly worthwhile program to help those less fortunate and work toward the goal—to make sure no child goes to bed hungry.

#### ADDRESS OF JUSTICE ANTONIN SCALIA AT THE NATIONAL DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY

### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, at an extremely moving ceremony in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol last Thursday, Members of Congress, the Diplomatic Corps, representatives of our Nation's executive and judicial branches, and hundreds of survivors of the Holocaust with their friends and family gathered to commemorate the National Days of Remembrance. This was an occasion when we take the time to remember the horror and inhumanity of the Holocaust.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the unspeakable horror of the Holocaust and the importance that we never forget that tragedy, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council was established by Congress to preserve the memory of the victims of the Holocaust. One of the most important tasks in this effort is the annual Days of Remembrance commemoration in the rotunda of our Nation's Capitol. This year, Antonin Scalia, Associate Justice of the U.S.